

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,355	07/27/2001	Matthew Howle	A148 1571	7567
75	90 02/02/2004		EXAMINER	
Steven L. Schmid			FORTUNA, JOSE A	
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC P.O. Box 7037 ART UNIT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Atlanta, GA 3	0357-0037		1731	
			DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

e tr	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/916,355	HOWLE ET AL.	
, taricory riodon	Examiner	Art Unit	
	José A Fortuna	1731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	dress
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avertinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment whicl I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper rep	ation in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Cere is the period of the control of the contro	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final reject HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the appoint of the fee. The apportionally set in the final	ion. See MPEP ropriate extension ropriate extension Office action: or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF) 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	ıs.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requesting the application in condition for allowance be application. 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ecause: See Continuation Sheet.		·
 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we 			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>8-25</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9.☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
0. Other:			
		Jose A Forting	une

José A Fortuna Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1731

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The declaration amounts to just allegation of patentability, i.e., applicant(s) theory of why the composition works in the way described, but it does not point out any data that validates the alleged unexpected results.